Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—In inam villages after acquisition takes place, there will be surplus land. For instance under the Records of Rights Act, Inam Abolition Deputy Commissioners cannot function as regular Deputy Commissioners. This Bill helps the Government to entrust those Deputy Commissioners with these functions.

†Sri R.M. PATIL.—Mr. Speaker, with humility I submit that the suggestions made by the Hon'ble members in respect of this Bill are worthy being noted from the point of view of finance. At the same time we have to consider the feasibility and possibility of gearing up the administrative machinery so as to satisfy the needs of the public. Today we see that there is a good deal of deficiency. There is no doubt that the Additional Deputy Commissioners may draw more salary than their subordinates. But at the same time the Additional Deputy Commissioner is given more and special works under several enactments. As far as Mandya is concerned, there is a scheme sponsored by the Government of India and it has to be administered by an officer of the rank of Deputy Commissioner. Under such circumstances it has become an imperative necessity to appoint Additional Deputy Commissioners. So, a Notification was issued and to regularise that appointment, this Bill has been brought. Similarly in the districts of Belgaum, Dharwar and Bijapur, the developmental works have been growing tremendously and there have been some delays because the Deputy Commissioner cannot function effectively on account of heavy work. In order to expedite such matters, a special Act is absolutely essential. Under such circumstancess the Government have thought it fit to sponsor this Bill. I hope my friend, on the other side will agree with me and withdraw their remarks rather than asking me to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Additional Deputy Commissioners (Appoint, ment and Powers) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.— As there are no amendments, I will put the clauses. The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 6, (both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 6 both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 1, the Preamble and the Title stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Preamble and the Title were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri R. M. PATIL.—I beg to move.

"That the Mysore Additional Deputy Commissioners (Appointment and Powers) Bill, 1962, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Additional Deputy Commissioners (Appointment and Powers) Bill, 1962, be passed."

I think the Ayes will have it. The Bill is passed.

The motion was adopted.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I demand a division.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think, my friend is right in asking for a division now. Immediately I said "I think the Ayes will have it," the member should have asked for a division.

MYSORE PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE FORESTS BILL 1962.

Motion to consider

Sri B. RACHIAH (Minister for Agriculture, Forests and Co-operation).—I beg to move:

(SRI B. RACHIAH)

"That the Mysore Preservation of Private Forests Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

MR. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Preservation of Private Forests Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

†SRI B. RACHIAH.—This is a very simple, useful and non-controversial measure intended to replace the Ordinance promulgated on 21-2-1962 when the Legislature was not in session. The Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act was in force in South Canara, Coorg and Kollegal. That Act was in force till 1949 and it was extended from time to time till 1961. After that, there was no option but to promulgate an ordinance. This is a very useful measure to preserve and maintain private forests.

4-30 P.M.

This Bill provides for preventing indiscriminate destruction of private forests and also for preventing the interference of the customary prescriptive right therein. Clause 5provides for regulating these acts. Clause 6 is a penal clause. If any person were to commit any offence, under this provision, penalty would be imposed with an imprisonment of two years or with a levy of fine of five thousand rupees or both. So, this deterrent punishment, I think in the interests of the forest wealth, under this clause, is very necessary. If there is any lenience, there will be indiscriminate destruction of private forests and the private owners will encroach on State forests and exploit and smuggle forest timber. With this end in view this Bill has been proposed. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it is clearly mentioned that by introducing such a measure, we will have effective control over our private forests, and also check the smuggling of our forest wealth. Under clause 11, the State Government have got powers to make rules and place them before the Legislature. No additional expenditure will be incurred in this regard and with the available staff, the Government will manage to implement the provisions of this Bill. With these few remarks, I commend the Bill for the acceptance of this august House.

† SRI B. P. KADAM.—Sir, the object of this Bill seems to be to avoid the indiscriminate felling of the forest produce, whether it is that of private or Government forest. The greater object of this Bill seems to be to prevent pilferage under one guise or the other. But there ought to have been certain reservations for protecting those people whose private forests are limited up to an extent—say two to five acres and of quality. By quality, I mean species of timber which the land contains. In essence,it becomes extremely difficult to implement the provisions of this Bill. One grave defect in this Bill is that there will be a great deal of scope for corruption at all levels, for under the entire legislation, civil suits are barred. Civil litigation has been barred and the Deputy Commissioner and the Government seem to be all powerful under this legislation. The Divisional Commissioner has to notify, or has to give his permission for all purposes. Then, if any party is aggrieved by the order of the Deputy Commissioner an appealcan be preferred straight to the Government. I certainly object to the provision of clause 4. I cannot understand why an ordinary villager at a remote distance, if he is aggrieved by the order—which is an executive order of the Deputy Commissioner–should straight away run to the Vidhana Soudha. For, in between the two, there lies the Office of the Divisional Commissioner who is competent under various executive provisions to hear the appeal against the orders of the Deputy Commissioner. I, therefore, do not see any reason why the Divisional Commissioner is not to be vested with appellate power. Therefore, I strongly resent the action of the Government to make the ordinary man run to the Vidhana Soudha and to the Government against an order of the Deputy Commissioner under this law. Sir, I have raised this objection specifically for the following reasons. In this State, there is much scope for

corruption. There are a large number of people at all levels whose only duty is to flatter Ministers and would be Ministers and those who are in the run. That number is wide and large. The figure of such self-styled social workers, whose only work is to deliver sermons and arrange functions, garland those in power and nothing else, is large. Under one guise or another, it is these self-styled social workers who are extremely corrupt and who influence the Government. That is why I say there would be a large scope for corruption.

Then, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I certainly object to the provision contained in clause 10. What is the provision?

> "No order of the State Government or the Deputy Commissioner under this Act and no notification issued by the State Government under section 5 shall be liable to be questioned in any court of law."

What sort of a provision is this, Mr. Speaker? This seems to be an order of an ancient dictator like Ceaser. Why should a civil court be barred? Why should the Government be all-powerful and mighty? Are we in a dictatorial regime? Therefore, I object to this particular clause. I request the Hon'ble Minister to delete that provision. This is nothing but a dictatorial provision which would give scope for large-scale corruption and all sorts of evil practices for all concerned, for all those self-styled social workers. With these remarks, I resume my seat.

†Sri A. P. APPANNA (Virajpet).— Mr. Speaker, while supporting this Bill, I want to place before the Government some of the defects that may ensue when this is passed. A similar Act has been in force in my district. But the provisions of that Act have been mis used by the officers in the district. In the office of the Deputy Commissioner, there are lots of pending papers in connection with the sale of timber. Under the cover of the provisions of the Act, even though the valuation of the timber is made, and even though the valuation charges have been paid, the papers are not passed by the Deputy Commissioner. Likewise even though this Bill may prevent smuggling of timber from the Government forests, it has been going on in Coorg District, where a similar Act has been in force hitherto. Some bogus passes have been issued by the officers, under which the private businessmen have been smuggling timber from Government lands. The mere passing of this Bill will not prevent these things; nor will it achieve the objects contemplated by this Bill. Hence I submit that keeping these defects in view the Government must give proper instructions to the concerned officers.

Then, Sir, I apprehend that under the cover of this Act some officers may misuse the powers and harass some of the land owners growing coffee estates who want to do thinning of shades by removing some trees. Especially in Coorg where most of the plantations are there the Deputy Commissioner may now give permission to the land owners to regulate the shades in the coffee estates. This is likely to hamper the growth of coffee estates in Coorg, I would request Government to examine this point and issue the necessary instructions to the officers.

With these remarks, I conclude.

†Sri H. R. KESHAVAMURTHY.— I want to say only a few words about the objects of this Bill. This Bill will curtail the liberties of the landed class which is already hit hard by the Land Reforms Act. This Bill is another stroke against the land owners. The land owners are not even allowed to have their private forests. Actually they are not forests, but they are just small extents of land where trees are grown from which some products like coffee are obtained. That is the only purpose of such forests and nothing else. These trees were not grown in one or two years. These people have by the sweat of their brow for years grown these trees for generations and now by this Act those trees are sought to be snatched away from them. So this Act is a great injustice to them. It seems that Government want to give some trouble or the other to the landholders. So in the interests of the landholders I am forced to oppose this Bill tooth and nail.

†Sri GANJI VEERAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I was under the impression that this Bill would meet with no opposition from the other side because this is a very healthy piece of legislation. I thought the Government would be congratulated on the introduction of such a healthy measure to control the private forests. The term 'private forest' is defined in the Bill itself. In order to make this Act applicable, the private forest must be a contiguous one and over one hundred acres. Otherwise this Act will not be applicable. There need not be any fear that cultivated land will be declared forest land by Government because before so declaring Government has to see whether it is a land fit for cultivation, etc.

Then, Sir, we see so much of wastage of trees. In fact, on the plea that it is their own forest, they come to the neighbouring State forest and cut trees there because nobody will be there to keep a watch over every tree. We see so much of timber coming to the market stealthily. This wastage has to be controlled and checked. This Bill has been introduced to prevent such stealthy removal of trees from State forests.

Then my friend Sri Kadam referred to clause 10 which says that "no order of the State Government or the Deputy Commissioner under this Act ..... shall be liable to be questioned in any court of law." This is not a new thing. Similar provision is to be found in all special Acts. Even in the Tenancy Act there is such a provision. Moreover, here the Deputy Commissioner is not the final authority, but Government is the appellate authority under clause 4. What is prevented by clause 10 is only questioning the Government order in a civil court.

Sri B. P. KADAM.—Under the Tenancy Act, there is a separate forum for hearing appeals.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—Here also appeals are to be preferred to the State Government. What is sought to be prevented is going to the civil court because if permission is given to go to civil courts orders of Government can be stayed for ten years on an appeal to a civil court. If that is allowed then the object of the Act will be frustrated. So it is but proper that such a provision is made in this Bill, barring proceedings before a civil court.

With these remarks I commend this Bill for the acceptance of the House.

†Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill before the House is intended to prevent the indiscriminate destruction of private forests and interference with customary and prescriptive rights therein. This has been brought to replace an ordinance that has been promulgated in the month of December.

First of all, we have got to examine whether there was any necessity on the part of Government, to have an ordinance promulgated in the first instance. The ordinance could have been promulgated just to give life to the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act, 1949 which expired in December 1961. The Government knew fully well that that particular Act was going to expire in December and so the Government ought to have taken steps even when the Legislature was in session in October or November to give life to that particular Act. Generally, to resort to promulgation of ordinances for such purposes is not desirable and is not contemplated under the provisions of the Constitution. Therefore, I submit at the outset that this promulgation of ordinance itself was not warranted and was ill-conceived. The Government wants to give life to the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act, 1949 and also to make it uniformly applicable to the entire State. Is it necessary to do so at this juncture because, as you are aware, the Mysore Forests Bill that has been introduced in this House is pending consideration? It has not been considered, nor have we adopted that uniform law. Pending uniformity in that respect, is it absolutely necessary and inevitable to bring this Bill ? Therefore, I submit that this Bill is totally unwarranted. Unless the Government takes serious steps to bring in an uniform legislation in regard to the forest laws in the Mysore State, there is no moral justification to bring in such a law which is likely to be

reversed or modified. The Government could have waited till the uniform law is passed. Instead, they have come in a hurry with this Bill. I will presently show how very many of the provisions of this Bill are defective which may even go to the extent of defeating the very purpose for which this Bill has been brought in. No doubt, I welcome the spirit with which it has been brought, but before bringing this Bill Government could have thought more seriously so as to secure uniformity in respect of the five different forest laws prevailing in the five integrating units. But that has not been done. Clause 1 provides that it applies to private forests having a contiguous area exceeding one hundred acres. Suppose a person has got one hundred and ten acres. Just to defeat the purpose of this Act, he may convert twenty acres into some other kind of land and leave ninety acres within the forest. Is it not possible to defeat the purpose of this Act by resorting to such a method ? When the Government wants to give protection by means of an enactment, why should it not be done irrespective of the extent ? The intention is going to be defeated by the limitation that has been imposed in this clause. If Government is seriously intending to preserve these private forests, then it should apply this Act to all private forests irrespective of the extent.

The definitions that have been given are not exhaustive. For instance, the definition of 'Forest' is that it includes waste or communal land containing trees and shrubs, pasture land and any other class of land declared by the State Government to be a forest by notification in the Official Gazette. So, Government may, by notification, declare what are the other kinds of lands that can be brought under the definition of forest. Government should have been specific as to what 'Forest' is. The existing definition is vague and likely to be misused.

Then, in clause (3) it is said: "No owner of any forest shall, without the previous sanction of the Deputy Commissioner, sell, mortgage, lease or otherwise alienate the whole or any portion of the forest." The intention with which this Bill has been brought is to prevent the indiscriminate destruction of private forests and interference with customary and prescriptive rights therein. When such is the intention, I want to know what is the purpose behind this clause which prevents altogether sale, mortgage, lease or alienation. Suppose a gentleman owns about two hundred acres of private forests. Why should he ask the permission of the Deputy Commissioner to mortgage or sell or lease or alienate it ? What is the motive behind that, I have not understood. Even if a person purchases from the owner a private forest, he has got to preserve it according to the provisions of this Act. These forests have to be maintained irrespective of the ownership. So, I do not understand the significance of clause 3 which prohibits all those things without the consent of the Deputy Commissioner. Then, the 'Explanation' to clause (3) says.

> "Nothing in this sub-section shall be construed as preventing the owner from selling or otherwise dealing with the right to gather and remove forest produce other than trees and timber in the usual or customary manner, for a period not exceeding two years."

What 'forest produce' is, is not known. It has not been defined, other than 'trees and timber' produce may be anything. Even charcoal may be a forest produce.

5.00 P.M.

Sri B. RACHAIAH.—That is defined in the Forest Act.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—We should not be asked to refer to other Acts for the definition. It is stated in cluase 3 that one can remove forest produce other than trees and timber in the usual or customary manner for a period not exceeding two years. My submission is that even charcoal would be forest produce. If an owner of private forest were to cut his trees and convert them into charcoal, would it be allowed? When your intention is to preserve forest, it would be misconstrued if you do not give the meaning of the words 'forest produce'.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—May I draw the attention of the Hon'ble Member to clause 2 (5) which says :

> "The expression 'forest officer', 'tree', 'timber', 'forest produce,, and 'cattle' shall have the meanings respectively assigned to them in section 2 of the Mysore Forest Act, 1900, or the corresponding enactment in force in any area of the State."

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—So far as other areas are concerned, the respective forest laws are in vogue and the expression forest produce is defined in a different way therein. Even charcoal is classified as forest produce. If an owner converts timber into charcoal, is it the intention of the enactment to allow such things ? Therefore I am submitting that unless you define what forest produce is, then four or five different definitions will apply ; there may be unanimity in this respect. Still it ought to have been defined in this Act. A purchase for consideration in good faith cannot be ruled out as void. But in 3 (1) (*b*) it is said that any alienation in contravention of clause (*a*) shall be null and void. It should not affect *bona fide* purchases for consideration. Without notice, we are making an enactment. It should not be inconsistent with the rule that is prevailing in the land. In sub-clause (3) of Section 3 it is said :

> "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2), the State Government may exempt any forest or class of forests or class of trees therein from all or any of the provisions of this Section."

I want to ask the Government, if they honestly believe in implementing the sections of this Act, why should they have sub-clause (3)? If they want to preserve private forest from being destroyed, why should they have power to exempt any class of forests from the operation of this Act ? I am, therefore, submitting that sub-clause(3) is unnecessary. It may enable the Government to misuse this power. Why should you make such a provision and in times to come allow it to be misused ? Therefore, in order to avoid all these suspicions and doubts, it is desirable to remove sub-section (3). So far as appeals are concerned, provision for appeal to the State Governmet has been made. But it would have been better if provision had been made for preferring appeal to the Revenue Appellate Tribunal. We are aware that decisions of this Tribunal are to a large extent of judicious nature. From that point of view it is desirable that provisions should have been made for appeals to the Revenue Appellate Tribunal instead of Government.

Sir, in clause 8 it is provided that no prosecution shall be instituted against any person under this Act without the sanction of the Deputy Commissioner. Here again there is another trouble; for any and every thing they have to run to the Deputy Commissioner. At times the very purpose for which the Government intends to enact this law is likely to be affected. So far as the bar of suits is concerned, I do not have anything to say except that though Civil Courts are not given jurisdiction to entertain suits, they cannot prevent the same being taken to the High Court. In all, I should say that this Bill is mostly defective and the promulgation of the ordinance was unnecessary and uncalled for and the Government could have taken steps seriously to bringin uniformity in respect of the forest laws throughout the State and then they could have thought of introducing legislation just to achieve the intention with which this Bill is made. Therefore though I welcome the principles or the motive behind it, I am opposed to it for the reasons I have already submitted.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಯ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗಾಗಿ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರುವ "The Mysore Preservation of Private Forests Bill, 1962." ಎಂಬ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಕೆಲವು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಆಶಯಗಳನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತ ಪಡಿಸಿದರು. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಒಂದು ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸನ್ನು, ಎಂದರೆ, ನುಗ್ಗ್ರೀವಾಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನು ಕಾನೂನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದೆ. ಯಾವುದೇ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತರುವಾಗ ಅದನ್ನು ವಿಶೇಶವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ತರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕಾದ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು.

ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಈಗ ನಾವು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳು ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸಾರಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿವೆ. ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ತರತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಮ, ಅವಸರ, ಎಲ್ಲವೂ ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ವಾಗತಕ್ಕ ತಾರೀಕು ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಮೊದಲೇ ಜಾಗರೂಕತೆಯಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುವ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಬಹುಶಃ ಆಗಿನ ಅರಣ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮರೆತಿದ್ದರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಮೊದಲನೆ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೈರ್ ಆದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿರಬೇಕು. ಇದನ್ನು ಯಾರೋ ಸೆಕ್ರೆಟರಿಗಳು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿರಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಕಾನೂನಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ, ಈಗ ಕಾಡನ್ನು ಮನಬಂದಂತೆ ಕಡಿದು ನಾಶಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕಡಿದು ಮಾರಾಟಮಾಡಿ ಲಾಭ ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಿಂದ ನಿಂತು ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಭ್ರಮೆ ನನಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಾಡನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗಲೂ ಕಾನೂನಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗಾಗಿದೆಯೆನ್ನುವುದು ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಷಯ.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ವಿಶೇಷವಾದ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಕಾನೂನೇನೋ ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಇದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವೂಕೂಡ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ (3) ಸಬ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ (2)ರ ಒಳಕ್ಲಾಜ್ (3)ರಲ್ಲಿ "Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) the State Government may exempt any forest or class of forests or class of trees therein from all or any of the provisions of this section" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಇಷ್ಟಪಟ್ಟರೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟು ಯಾವಕಾಡನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ, ಯಾವಜಾತಿಯ ಮರವನ್ನು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನಾಯ್ತು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಪುಡಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಹಬ್ಬ. ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪಾಡಿಗೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾಡು ಕಡಿಯುವವರನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹಿಡಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಕಾಡನ್ನು ಸಂರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಯಿತೇನು ? ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಅವಧಿ ಮುಗಿದು ಹೋಯಿತು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇವರು ಕೈಹಾಕಿದರೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯದ ತಕ್ಕಡಿ ಏರು ಪೇರು ಆಗದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯವನ್ನು ದೊರಕಿಸಿಕೊಡದಂಥ ಜನಗಳೇ ಸೇರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು ಹೇಳಿದರು :—ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ವಿವೇಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು. ಯಾವ ಮರವನ್ನು ಕಡಿಸುವುದು, ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕಡಿಸಬೇಕು, ಯಾವಕಾಡಿಗೆ ಏನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯ ಕೆಲಸ. ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯಕಾನೂನು ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ಬರೆದು ಇಂತಿಂಥಾ ಮರಗಳನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯಬಾರದು ಇಂತಿಥ ಕಾಡನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯ ಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವಂಥಾದ್ದೆಲ್ಲ ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ರಾಚಯ್ಯನವರು ಈಗತಾನೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೂ ನನ್ನಹಾಗೆ ಉತ್ಸಾಹವಿದೆ. ಯಾವ ಮರವನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯ ಬೇಕು, ಯಾವಕಾಡನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯ ಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ವಿವೇಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವಂಥಾ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕಾಡನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯುವುದು, ಕಾಡು ನಾಶವಾಗುವುದು ನಿಲ್ಲುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮಲೆನಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಡನ್ನು ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಬಂದು ಕಡಿಯುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬುದು ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಚಾರ್‌ಕೋಲಿಗೆ ನಾಟಾಗಳಿಗೆ ಖಾನಗೀಯವರೂ ಕಡಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಕಡಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಈ ಕಾಡಿನಿಂದ ಉಪಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈಗಲೂಕೂಡ ಕೊಂಚ ಉಪಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಲೇ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಿಂದಿನವರೆಲ್ಲಾ ಯಾವ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಅಧಿಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ರಹದಾರಿ ಪಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಕಾಡನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಲೂಟಿಮಾಡಿದರು. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲರುವ ಮರಗಳನ್ನಾದರೂ ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದು ರಾಜ್ಯದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿನ ಪೀಳಿಗೆಗಾದರೂ ನೆಳಲು ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನಗೆ ಕನ್‌ವಿಕ್ಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಶಿಕ್ಷೆ ಡೆಟರೆಂಟ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಯಾರನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿಯಬೇಕು, ಯಾರನ್ನು ಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವಂಥಾ ವಿವೇಚನಾ ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ? ಯಾರನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದು ಶಿಕ್ಷೆಗೆ ಗುರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವೇಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾಡನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯತಕ್ಕ ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್‌ರುಗಳು ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದವರಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಚಾವಣೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಬಚಾವಣೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಕಾಡಿನಿಂದ ಉಪಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅವರು ಅಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ಹಿಂದುಗಡೆ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆಗಬಾರದು. ವಿವೇಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಂಥಾಮರವನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯಬೇಕು, ಇಂಥಾಮರವನ್ನು ಕಡಿಯಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ವಿವೇಚನೆ ಮಾಡದಿರುವಂಥ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಆರೀತಿ ವಿವೇಚನೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅರಣ್ಯವನ್ನು ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟೇಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

ಆಮೇಲೆ ಅಪೀಲು ಹಾಕಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ ಇದೆ. ಅಪೀಲು ಹೋಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದೆಯೋ ಅದು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೇ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾಗುವುದಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಯಾರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ವಿಷಯ. ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಲೋಚನೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ)

ಮಾಡಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಡಳಿತ ಯಂತ್ರ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಹುಷಾರಾಗಿ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಇವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರು ಅವಸರವಾಗಿ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಅವಸರ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು. ಇದನ್ನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಶಿಫಾರ್ಸುಮಾಡಲು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

*Sri M. MALLIKARJUNA SWAMY (Kirugavalu).—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this simple Bill, seeking to replace the ordinance. Hitherto I was listening with rapt attention to the arguments, counter-arguments and criticisms by the members on the opposition side. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the House in this connection that this simple Bill seeking to replace the ordinance will go a long way in maintaining the spirit of the Forest Resolution of 1952 also. As you know, it is considered necessary as stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It says:

> "It is considered necessary that legislative provision should be made for preventing indiscriminate destruction of private forests and interference with customary and prescriptive rights therein."

We have seen and known many instances in which persons who are owning these private forests are simply destroying the forests. Not only that, but they are also encouraging the destruction of State forests. In this connection, I would like to say that the preservation of the physical and climatic conditions is also an important factor in maintaining the well-being of the people. In the Forest Policy Resolution of 1952, we see that forests should be raised and maintained properly at least to the tune of 33% in the country and especially in the hilly regions to the extent of 60% and in the plains at least to the extent of about 20%. I think this Bill, if passed, and it is going to be passed, there is no doubt about it will go a long way in the amelioration of the physical and climatic conditions and the well-being of the people at large. Speaking about the penal clause of this Bill, my friend argued and laid emphasis on the point that it was not going to help in any way. Let me say that I agree and whole-heartedly endorse the opinion of my Forest friend. There is a kernel of proof in the statement that this is not a deterrent punishment. With these remarks, I would like to say that this is a wholesome measure and hope that this would be passed without any objection by my honourable friends in the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister for Forests.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇನ್ನಾರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆ? ಇದು ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಬಿಲ್ಲು. ಅರಣ್ಯ ಸಂಪತ್ತು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Members have not given notice of any amendment.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ.ಜೆ.ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾದರೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have called upon the Hon'ble Minister to reply.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—This is a very good measure and we will support the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member supports the Government, there is no further scope for discussion. I have already called upon the Hon'ble Minister to reply.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹದಿನೈದು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಹೇಳಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಏಕೆ ಅವಸರ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Then, there is some other work for the day.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಭಾರ ನಮ್ಮದು. ತಾವು ಕ್ಲಸಿಡರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾವೇನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister will continue.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲವೆ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Not on this Bill.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಇಬ್ಬರು ಮಹಿಳಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಯಾವಾಗ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. (ನಗು)

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member must not think every one who sits on those benches is a Minister. He is mistaken. Please do not have any misconception of this type.

*Sri B. RACHIAH.—Sir, I am really thankful to the Hon'ble Members who have given their wholehearted support

for the reasons with which this Bill is introduced. But there have been disputes about some provisions of this Bill. In the course of a few months a uniform Bill with regard to forest administration will be brought before the Legislature. Then the Hon'ble Members will have ample scope to suggest amendments and to correct the Government. But, for the time being, as I have already stated in my preliminary remarks, this Bill is inevitable, as it has been introduced, to replace the Ordinance which was promulgated when the Legislature was not in session. That is why this Bill has been introduced.

The Hon'ble Member Sri Kadam apprehended that there was no protection for small holders. If he reads clause 1 of this Bill, he will see that it applies only to the forests which have got a continuous area extending to one hundered acres.It does not apply to areas less than this limit. He expressed concern regarding a small holders and said that they should not be harassed by this provision. We are not doing so. Secondly under clause (3), sufficient provision has been made under the proviso that any individual is at liberty to remove dead and fallen trees and cut and remove the timber for agricultural purposes also. Under clause 3, sub-clause (3), the Government has got powers to give exemptions in cases which have been referred to by my Hon'ble friend from Coorg. In some of the Coffee plantations and arecanut plantations, they have to cut trees to give space to coffee plantations. That is why this provision has been incorporated to give protection to the land owners or the private forest owners. Regarding clause (10), this clause is not a special feature of this Bill. There have been such instances wherein this provision is also incorporated. It is only just to avoid the delay, to give expeditions relief to the parties that this clause has been introduced and Hon'ble Members will agree with me when I say that justice should not be delayed and that it should be given at a very early date. If there is any thing which will hamper the interests of the common man or the interests of the private owner, that will be looked into and if the Hon'ble Members feel that an amendment is necessary, at a later stage when a uniform Bill is going to be introduced that will be incorporated. For the time being, it is not only to protect the private forests but also to maintain a certain percentage of vegetation, this measure is necessary. The owners of private forest are more interested in getting greater income within the shortest period.

Sri H. R. KESAVAMURTHY.—We want to know whether land owners have no right to cut the trees which they have grown for generations.

Sri B. RACHIAH.—They have only to take the permission of the Deputy Commissioner, if it is more than one hundred acres, to cut or remove or do any such thing.

5-30 P.M.

Sri H. R. KESHAVAMURTHY.—They have no liberty to cut the trees without permission.

Sri B. RACHIAH.—He may do the cutting of trees. But that should be avoided. The State Forests are maintained by working laws, for both exploitation and also regeneration. But in the case of private forests, they are more interested only in exploiting but not in regenerating forests. That is why there have been ample provisions and protections to private forest owners also to grow more and more forest area and to maintain certain percentage of vegetation. If vegetation is not maintained, we will be deprived of rain in time and thereby we will be getting famine often. That is why this Bill is quite essential and I think after this explanation Hon'ble Members will give their support to this simple measure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Preservation of Private Forests Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There are no amendments. I will put the clauses and the schedule, to the vote.

The question is :

(MR. SPEAKER)

"That clauses 2 to 14, both inclusive and the Schedule stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 14, both inclusive, and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 1, the Preamble and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Preamble and the Title were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri B. RACHIAH.—I move:

"That the Mysore Preservation of Private Forests Bill, 1962, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Preservation of Private Forests Bill, 1962, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MOTION OF THANKS TO THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS.

Motion to consider.

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA (Harihar).—I beg to move:

"That we, the members of the Mysore Legislative Assembly assembled in this Session, beg leave to thank the Governor for the Address delivered to the Members of the Legislature on 15th March 1962."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That we, the members of the Mysore Legislative Assembly assembled in this Session beg leave to thank the Governor for the Address delivered to the Members of the Legislature on 15th March 1962."

Smt. BASAVARAJESWARI.—I second the motion.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Let us take up the discussion on this motion on ehe 30th March 1962.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Hon'ble Mover make his speech now ?

Sri GANJI VEERAPPA.—I leave it to the Hon'ble Speaker.

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—There are twenty-five minutes more. I think the Hon'ble Member who moved the motion may not require more than half an hour to complete his speech. Let him initiate the discussion and it is open to the Hon'ble Members to continue the discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Mover will speak and after that we will adjourn. Now the position is this: amendments should have come by 26th. But we have received amendments later, and so it has not been possibe to print and circulate them. Either I will have to disallow them or the Members must agree that they do not press for printed copies. I will try to give copies of them as the debate progresses. But all the points, I suppose, are covered by the previous amendments.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is the Mover speaking on both, the amendments and the motion ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendments have not been moved.

ಶ್ರೀ ಗಾಂಜಿ ವೀರಪ್ಪ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರು ಜಂಟಿ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕಳೆದ ವರ್ಷ ಮಾಡಿರುವ ತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ಹಾಲಿ ವರ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ನಿವೇದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ರೀತಿ ನೀತಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳು ದೇಶದ ಪ್ರಗತಿಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಿರುವುಗಳಾಗಿವೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು. ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿಚಕ್ಷಣೆಯಿಂದ, ತೆರೆದ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಿಂದ ಓದುವುದಾದರೆ ಬಹುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅವರ ನಿರ್ಧಾರಗಳೇನಿವೆ, ಅವರ ಟೀಕೆ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಗಳೇನಿವೆ ಅವು ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಇರಲಾರವು ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂಥ ಭಾಷಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಅವರನ್ನು ಅಭಿನಂದಿಸಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಅಗತ್ಯ.

ಪ್ರಥಮತಃ ರಾಜಪಾಲರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.—ನಾವು ಮೂರನೆಯ ಪಾಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯ ಎರಡ